

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-19 remain in this application and, as amended herein, are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 5, 7, 10, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Nickum (U.S. Patent No. 6,359,661). Applicants submit that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference.

In view of the Examiner's comments set out in the present Office Action and the Examiner's comments in the May 21, 2007 interview in response to the June 7, 2007 Office Action, claims 1, 10, and have been amended to more clearly show the distinctions over the relied on sections of Nickum. Support for these changes is found, e.g., in Figs. 1, 18A-B, 19A-B, 20, 21, 23, and 24 and in ¶ [0062]-[0064], [0081], [0110]-[0152] of the specification.

Claim 1, for example, calls for:

wherein the plurality of controlled hardware portions of the information processing apparatus is formed of functional subunits selected from the group consisting of a tuner subunit having a receiving function, a monitor subunit having a display function, and a recorder/player subunit having at least one of a recording function or a playback function, and the storage device does not include any functional subunits selected from that group.
(Emphasis added.)

The relied on sections of Nickum neither disclose nor suggest such features.

It follows, for at least the above reasons, that the relied-on sections of Nickum do not disclose or suggest the method defined in claim 1 and therefore do not anticipate the claim.

Independent claims 10 and 11 each define features

limitations similar to those set out above in the excerpts of claim 1. Therefore, each of claims 10 and 11 is distinguishable over the relied-on sections of Nickum at least for the same reasons.

Claims 5 and 7 depend from claim 1, and claim 16 depends from claim 10. Therefore, claims 5, 7, and 16 are each distinguishable over the relied-on sections of Nickum for at least the same reasons as its parent claim.

The Examiner also rejected claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nickum in further view of Croy; and rejected claims 3, 12, 14, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nickum in further view of Humpleman.

Claims 2-4, 6, 8-9, and 12 depend from claim 1, claims 13-15 and 17-18 depend from claim 10, and claim 19 depends from claim 11. Each of these claims is therefore distinguishable over the relied-on sections of Nickum for at least the same reasons as the claim from which it depends.

The relied-on sections of Croy and Humpleman do not remedy the above-described deficiencies of the relied-on sections of Nickum.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under §§ 102(e) and 103(a).

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

Application No.: 09/929,888


Docket No.: SONYJP 3.0-199

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: October 29, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By



Lawrence E. Russ

Registration No.: 35,342

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

808258_1.DOC